

Course-Section: WMST 100 0101
 Title INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES
 Instructor: KUSHNER, MIKHEL
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1498
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	1	3	22	4.45	639/1504	4.45	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	7	14	3.97	1085/1503	3.97	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	1	6	15	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	25	4.76	158/1421	4.76	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	5	7	11	3.96	830/1365	3.96	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	2	9	1	12	3.73	1188/1485	3.73	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	22	6	4.14	1360/1504	4.14	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	2	11	9	4.04	827/1483	4.04	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	0	3	16	4.57	700/1425	4.57	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	414/1418	4.63	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	366/1416	4.72	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	548/1199	4.19	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	1	19	4.61	297/1312	4.61	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	378/1303	4.74	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	283/1299	4.83	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	300/ 758	4.26	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.26

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	9	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: WMST 100H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1499
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1304/1503	3.50	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	878/1453	4.17	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1421	4.83	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	731/1483	4.17	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	860/1199	3.67	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	3.80	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: WMST 322 0101
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: Brown, Sonya
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1500
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	4	13	4	3.60	1322/1504	3.85	4.24	4.27	4.27	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	8	7	3.75	1207/1503	3.92	4.22	4.20	4.22	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1290	4.47	4.32	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	4	9	8	3.88	1123/1453	4.03	4.22	4.21	4.23	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	14	4.33	479/1421	4.12	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	10	4.21	637/1365	4.14	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	7	8	7	3.68	1214/1485	3.94	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	23	1	4.00	1411/1504	3.88	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	10	3	3.89	1009/1483	4.03	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	888/1425	4.35	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	451/1426	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	12	4.38	736/1418	4.28	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	498/1416	4.48	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	446/1199	4.29	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	17	4.42	454/1312	4.51	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	268/1303	4.72	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	233/1299	4.76	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	3	3	8	6	3.71	518/ 758	3.80	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.71
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	58/ 76	4.53	4.60	4.61	4.84	4.53
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	41/ 70	4.48	4.54	4.35	4.24	4.58
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	43/ 67	4.14	4.32	4.34	3.98	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	55/ 76	4.31	4.41	4.44	4.51	4.28
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	2	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	59/ 73	3.93	4.17	4.17	4.25	3.65
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	13	Under-grad	25	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	5	
?	0			

Course-Section: WMST 322 0201
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: Brown, Sonya
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1501
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	11	13	4.09	1052/1504	3.85	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	9	13	4.10	996/1503	3.92	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	561/1290	4.47	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	15	12	4.19	844/1453	4.03	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	9	12	3.90	863/1421	4.12	4.08	4.00	4.01	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	7	9	11	4.07	742/1365	4.14	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	3	8	16	4.20	830/1485	3.94	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	7	23	0	3.77	1465/1504	3.88	4.68	4.69	4.65	3.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	7	8	14	4.17	731/1483	4.03	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	12	15	4.28	1015/1425	4.35	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	27	4.81	714/1426	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	12	13	4.19	905/1418	4.28	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	19	4.34	799/1416	4.48	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	5	5	18	4.27	487/1199	4.29	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	3	22	4.61	297/1312	4.51	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	2	1	23	4.61	507/1303	4.72	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	1	1	24	4.64	464/1299	4.76	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	2	0	4	4	8	3.89	476/ 758	3.80	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	58/ 76	4.53	4.60	4.61	4.84	4.53
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	50/ 70	4.48	4.54	4.35	4.24	4.39
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	3	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	52/ 67	4.14	4.32	4.34	3.98	3.94
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	54/ 76	4.31	4.41	4.44	4.51	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	38/ 73	3.93	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.22

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	32	Non-major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: WMST 326 0101
 Title HIST/AMER WMN SINCE 18
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1502
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	5	20	4.54	509/1504	4.54	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	12	12	4.21	891/1503	4.21	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	7	18	4.46	561/1290	4.46	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	631/1453	4.37	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	6	19	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	9	14	4.21	625/1365	4.21	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	7	16	4.29	727/1485	4.29	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	263/1504	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	1	12	6	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	1	3	7	11	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	738/1426	4.80	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	0	9	11	4.27	828/1418	4.27	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	7	12	4.22	904/1416	4.22	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	5	6	9	4.10	603/1199	4.10	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.10

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	4	17	4.26	592/1312	4.26	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	288/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	1	23	4.74	364/1299	4.74	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	0	2	6	2	7	3.82	491/ 758	3.82	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.82

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	29	Non-major	3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: WMST 338 0101
 Title WOMEN AND LAW
 Instructor: Andronici, Just
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1503
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	284/1504	4.74	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	663/1503	4.39	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	488/1290	4.52	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	320/1453	4.62	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	104/1421	4.87	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	129/1365	4.77	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	9	9	4.09	948/1485	4.09	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	481/1483	4.39	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	19	4.77	384/1425	4.77	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	354/1418	4.68	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	366/1416	4.73	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	268/1303	4.83	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	6	14	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: WMST 352 0101
 Title GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO
 Instructor: BENVENGA, MICHE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1504
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	258/1503	4.71	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	363/1453	4.57	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	223/1421	4.64	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	78/1485	4.93	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	940/1504	4.71	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	506/1483	4.36	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	158/1418	4.86	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	271/1199	4.50	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1303	4.70	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: WMST 390D 0101
 Title QUEER REPRESENT FILM/T
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1505
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	17	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	437/1503	4.55	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	135/1453	4.84	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	241/1421	4.62	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	705/1485	4.30	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	3	4.15	1345/1504	4.15	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	876/1425	4.42	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	643/1426	4.84	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	552/1418	4.53	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	574/1416	4.56	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	527/1199	4.21	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	663/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	385/1299	4.72	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	255/ 758	4.38	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	14	Under-grad	21	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: WMST 490B 0101
 Title CULT POL: POPULTN CONT
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1506
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	669/1504	4.43	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	392/1421	4.43	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	240/1485	4.71	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1490/1504	3.17	4.68	4.69	4.73	3.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	543/1483	4.33	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	317/1418	4.71	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1190/1199	1.50	3.95	3.97	4.05	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	4.05	4.01	4.17	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: WMST 495 0101
 Title RESEARCH & ACTIVISM SE
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1507
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1421	4.60	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	645/1365	4.20	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1314/1504	4.20	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1076/1425	4.20	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1050/1426	4.60	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						